



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/736,914	12/14/2000	Thomas S. Neary	92220/12408	8976

7590 01/02/2003

Kenneth P. Robinson
474 New York Avenue, Ste 1
Huntington, NY 11743

EXAMINER

ELAHEE, MD S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2697

DATE MAILED: 01/02/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/736,914

Applicant(s)

NEARY, THOMAS S.

Examiner

Md S Elahee

Art Unit

2697

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 4, 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mitchell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,164,981).

Regarding claims 1 and 11, Mitchell discloses prerecorded message to be provided by voice response unit (fig.3; col.6, lines 43-54; 'prerecorded message' reads on the claim 'predetermined prompt data representative of content of correct utterances'; 'voice response unit' reads on the claim 'interactive audio system in response to specific data inputs').

Mitchell further discloses the caller providing information responsive to a prerecorded message received from the voice response unit (fig.3; col.6, lines 53-57; 'providing' reads on the claim 'sending', 'information' reads on the claim 'a first data input', 'prerecorded message' reads on the claim 'first prompt signal' and 'voice response unit' reads on the claim 'interactive audio system').

Mitchell further discloses receiving other informational prompts responsive to the information and including selected numbers (abstract; fig.3; col.1, lines 62-68, col.6, lines 55-68, col.7, lines 1-8; 'other informational prompts' reads on the claim 'a second prompt signal',

‘information’ reads on the claim ‘a first data input’ and ‘selected numbers’ reads on the claim ‘coded signals representing content of an utterance label’).

Mitchell further discloses inherently comparing entry in response to other informational prompts against the entry as represented by the prerecorded message (‘entry’ reads on the claim ‘content of said utterance label, as represented by such coded signals’, ‘other informational prompts’ reads on the claim ‘a second prompt signal’ and ‘the entry as represented by the prerecorded message’ reads on the claim ‘content of an expected utterance label, as represented by the predetermined prompt data’).

Regarding claim 4, Mitchell further discloses the caller providing information responsive to other informational prompts received from the voice response unit (fig.3; col.6, lines 53-57; ‘providing’ reads on the claim ‘sending’, ‘information’ reads on the claim ‘a second data input’, ‘other informational prompts’ reads on the claim ‘second prompt signal’ and ‘voice response unit’ reads on the claim ‘interactive audio system’).

Mitchell further discloses receiving other informational prompts responsive to the information (abstract; fig.3; col.1, lines 62-68, col.6, lines 55-68, col.7, lines 1-8; ‘other informational prompts’ reads on the claim ‘a third prompt signal’ and ‘information’ reads on the claim ‘second data signal’).

Mitchell further discloses inherently comparing entry in response to other informational prompts against the entry as represented by informational prompts (‘entry’ reads on the claim ‘content of an utterance label, as represented by coded signals’, ‘other informational prompts’ reads on the claim ‘third prompt signal’ and ‘the entry as represented by the informational prompts’ reads on the claim ‘the predetermined prompt data’).

Regarding claim 9, Mitchell further discloses the voice response unit is an interactive voice response telephone system (col.2, lines 59-68, col.3, lines 1-14; 'voice response unit' reads on the claim 'interactive audio system').

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2, 5, 12-15 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitchell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,164,981) and in view of Hank et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,321,198).

Regarding claims 2 and 12, Mitchell further discloses the caller providing information responsive to a prerecorded message received from the voice response unit (fig.3; col.6, lines 53-57; 'providing' reads on the claim 'sending', 'information' reads on the claim 'a first data input', 'prerecorded message' reads on the claim 'first prompt signal' and 'voice response unit' reads on the claim 'interactive audio system') via a call connection to the voice response unit (col.3, lines 15-23; 'voice response unit' reads on the claim 'interactive audio system'). However, Mitchell fails to teach "activating the CFV mode by sending the CFV sequence code". Hank teaches activating the IVR call flow by sending the call flow code (abstract; fig.3, fig.4, fig.11, fig.12; col.4, lines 25-32, col.11, lines 21-54; 'IVR call' reads on the claim 'CFV mode' and 'call flow code' reads on the claim 'CFV sequence code'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mitchell to activate the

Art Unit: 2697

CFV mode as taught by Hank. The motivation for the modification is to enhance the ability to create a call flow by producing call flow code.

Regarding claims 5, 13, 15 and 24, Mitchell further discloses signaling means comprising DTMF signals representing response (col.4, lines 7-11; 'signaling means' reads on the claim 'coded signals' and 'response' reads on the claim 'utterance label'). However, Mitchell fails to teach "utterance label characters in ASCII format". Hank teaches caller speech converted in ASCII format (col.3, lines 40-44; 'caller speech converted' reads on the claim 'utterance label characters'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mitchell to represent utterance label characters in ASCII format as taught by Hank. The motivation for the modification is to introduce ASCII characters so that it can be recognized and understood by other computers and by communication devices.

Regarding claim 14, Mitchell further fails to teach "providing an interactive voice response (IVR) system having a selectable call-flow verification (CFV) mode in which content of utterances responsive to an incoming call is represented by coded signals included in prompt signals, the CFV mode selectable by a CFV sequence code". Hank teaches providing an interactive voice response (IVR) system having a selectable IVR call in which content inherently responsive to an incoming call represented by coded signals included in prompt signals, the CFV mode selectable by a call flow code (abstract; fig.2, fig.3, fig.4, fig.11, fig.12; col.4, lines 25-32, col.6, lines 44-46, col.11, lines 21-54; 'IVR call' reads on the claim 'call-flow verification (CFV) mode', 'content' reads on the claim 'content of utterances' and 'call flow code' reads on the claim 'CFV sequence code'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mitchell to provide IVR system having the CFV

Art Unit: 2697

mode as taught by Hank. The motivation for the modification is to enhance the ability to make a selection of call flow by call flow code.

Mitchell discloses further prerecorded message to be provided by voice response unit (fig.3; col.6, lines 43-54; 'prerecorded message' reads on the claim 'predetermined prompt data representative of content of correct utterances'; 'voice response unit' reads on the claim 'interactive audio system in response to specific data inputs').

Mitchell further fails to teach "activating the CFV mode by sending the CFV sequence code". Hank teaches activating the IVR call flow by sending the call flow code (abstract; fig.3, fig.4, fig.11, fig.12; col.4, lines 25-32, col.11, lines 21-54; 'IVR call' reads on the claim 'CFV mode' and 'call flow code' reads on the claim 'CFV sequence code'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mitchell to activate the CFV mode as taught by Hank. The motivation for the modification is to enhance the ability to create a call flow by producing call flow code.

Mitchell further discloses the caller providing information responsive to a prerecorded message received from the voice response unit (fig.3; col.6, lines 53-57; 'providing' reads on the claim 'sending', 'information' reads on the claim 'a first data input', 'prerecorded message' reads on the claim 'first prompt signal' and 'voice response unit' reads on the claim 'interactive audio system').

Mitchell further discloses receiving from the voice response unit other informational prompts responsive to the information (abstract; fig.3; col.1, lines 62-68, col.6, lines 55-68, col.7, lines 1-8; 'other informational prompts' reads on the claim 'a second prompt signal',

Art Unit: 2697

‘information’ reads on the claim ‘a first data input’ and ‘voice response unit’ reads on the claim ‘interactive audio system’).

Mitchell further discloses inherently comparing entry in response to other informational prompts against the entry as represented by the prerecorded message (‘entry’ reads on the claim ‘content of said utterance label, as represented by such coded signals’, ‘other informational prompts’ reads on the claim ‘a second prompt signal’ and ‘the entry as represented by the prerecorded message’ reads on the claim ‘content of an expected utterance label, as represented by the predetermined prompt data’).

5. Claims 3 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitchell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,164,981) and in view of Shimada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,169,787).

Regarding claims 3 and 16, Mitchell further fails to teach “providing a record of discrepancies identified by comparing content in step (d)”. Shimada teaches providing a record of difference identified by comparing content (col.2, lines 26-39; ‘difference’ reads on the claim ‘discrepancies’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mitchell to record the difference between the contents as taught by Shimada. The motivation for the modification is to approve the transaction based on the contents matching recorded in the database.

6. Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitchell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,164,981) and in view of Matthews et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,602,129).

Regarding claim 6, Mitchell further fails to teach “the interactive audio system is adapted to enable activation of the CVF mode by transmission of a CVF mode activation command remotely to the interactive audio system”. However, Matthews further teaches user dialing

Art Unit: 2697

command for name record (fig.27, step 1550; 'dialing command' reads on the claim 'activation command remotely') or user dialing "9" for recording a prompt message on his RO message (fig.36, step 1842; 'dialing "9"' reads on the claim 'activation command remotely') or user dialing the PIM command for recording a PIM (fig.38; 'dialing the PIM command' reads on the claim 'activation command remotely') through a voice response service for mailbox subscriber (col.69, lines 38-46; 'voice response service for mailbox subscriber' reads on the claim 'interactive audio system'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mitchell to enable activation of the CVF mode by transmission of a CVF mode activation command as taught by Matthews. The motivation for the modification is to dial the command through the interactive audio system.

Regarding claim 7, Mitchell further discloses the voice response unit adapted on a per call basis (col.2, lines 59-68, col.3, lines 1-14; 'voice response unit' reads on the claim 'interactive audio system'). Mitchell further fails to teach enabling the activation of the CVF mode while the CVF mode is activated. However, Matthews further teaches enabling the activation of the data flow while the data flow is inherently activated (fig.23, fig.24; col.32, lines 22-54; 'data flow' reads on the claim 'CVF mode'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mitchell to enable activation of the CVF mode as taught by Matthews. The motivation for the modification is to complete the call dialing the command.

Regarding claim 8, Mitchell further discloses the voice response unit responsive to DTMF (col.4, lines 7-11; 'the voice response unit' reads on the claim 'the interactive audio system' and 'DTMF' reads on the claim 'CFV sequence code'). Mitchell further fails to teach "activate the

Art Unit: 2697

CFV mode when said mode is currently deactivated”. However, Matthews further teaches the activation of the data flow when the data flow is inherently deactivated (fig.23, fig.24; col.32, lines 22-54; ‘data flow’ reads on the claim ‘CVF mode’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mitchell to activate the CVF mode as taught by Matthews. The motivation for the modification is to complete the call dialing the command.

7. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitchell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,164,981) and in view of Szlam et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,594,791).

Regarding claim 10, Mitchell further fails to teach “an automated call generator having access to said predetermined prompt data, to script data for calls placed to the interactive audio system, and to stored received prompt signals”. Szlam teaches an automated customer service having access to the prompt data, to strategy script for calls placed to the interactive process, and inherently to stored received prompt signals (abstract; fig.5, fig.7; col.6, lines 17-49, col.7, lines 26-33, col.19, lines 64-68, col.20, lines 29, col.23, lines 14-40; ‘automated customer service’ reads on the claim ‘automated call generator’, ‘prompt data’ reads on the claim ‘predetermined prompt data’ and ‘strategy script’ reads on the claim ‘script data’ and ‘interactive process’ reads on the claim ‘interactive audio system’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mitchell to have the automated call generator as taught by Szlam. The motivation for the modification is for handling making many outgoing calls.

8. Claims 17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitchell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,164,981) and in view of Lotito et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,625,081).

Regarding claim 17, Mitchell fails to teach “at least one identification digit indicating the CFV mode is to be activated”. Lotito teaches inherently at least one identification code indicating the access send messages, access retrieve messages, and access administrative functions commands to be activated (col.156, lines 64-68, col. 157, lines 1-32; ‘code’ reads on the claim ‘digit’ and ‘the access send messages, access retrieve messages, and access administrative functions commands’ reads on the claim ‘CFV mode’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mitchell to have the identification digit indicating the CFV mode as taught by Lotito. The motivation for the modification is for the representation of the different CFV mode.

Mitchell further fails to teach “at least one frame digit indicating whether to include or exclude the utterance when providing an audio signal which includes the DTMF signals representing the content of such utterance”. Lotito teaches inherently at least one digit indicating whether to include or exclude the utterance when providing an audio signal including the DTMF signals representing the content (col.3, lines 59-68, col.4, lines 1-10; ‘frame digit’ reads on the claim ‘digit’ and ‘content’ reads on the claim ‘content of such utterance’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mitchell to have the frame digit indicating the inclusion or exclusion of the utterance as taught by Lotito. The motivation for the modification is for the representation of the contents of utterance label.

Mitchell further fails to teach “at least one extent digit identifying the number of characters of an utterance which are to be represented by the DTMF signals representing content of that utterance”. Lotito teaches inherently at least one extent digit identifying the number of message characters to be represented by the keyboard actions representing content (fig.13; col.140, lines 25-49, col.152, lines 48-57; ‘message characters’ reads on the claim ‘characters of an utterance’, ‘keyboard actions’ reads on the claim ‘DTMF signals’ and ‘content’ reads on the claim ‘content of that utterance’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mitchell to have the digit identifying the number of message characters as taught by Lotito. The motivation for the modification is for the representation of the contents of utterance label.

Regarding claim 20, Mitchell fails to teach “said code includes two identification digits to control activation of the CFV mode”. Lotito teaches inherently two identification digits controlling the activation of the access send messages, access retrieve messages, and access administrative functions commands (col.156, lines 64-68, col. 157, lines 1-32; ‘code’ reads on the claim ‘digit’ and ‘the access send messages, access retrieve messages, and access administrative functions commands’ reads on the claim ‘CFV mode’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mitchell to have the identification digit controlling the activation of the CFV mode as taught by Lotito. The motivation for the modification is for the activation of the different CFV mode.

9. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitchell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,164,981) and in view of Lotito et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,625,081) and further in view of Hank et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,321,198).

Regarding claim 18, Mitchell in view of Lotito fails to teach “said at least one extent digit identifies one of: a specific number of alphanumeric characters; and all of such characters of said utterance”. Hank teaches inherently at least one extent digit identifying one of caller speech converted in ASCII format (col.3, lines 40-44; ‘caller speech converted in ASCII format’ reads on the claim ‘a specific number of alphanumeric characters; and all of such characters of said utterance’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mitchell in view of Lotito to represent utterance label characters in ASCII format as taught by Hank. The motivation for the modification is to introduce ASCII characters so that it can be recognized and understood by other computers and by communication devices.

10. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitchell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,164,981) and in view of Lotito et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,625,081) and further in view of Elliott et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,335,927).

Regarding claim 19, Mitchell in view of Lotito fails to teach “said at least one identification digit indicates both activation of an inactive CFV mode and deactivation of a previously activated CFV mode”. Elliott teaches item ‘3’ indicating to both activation of features and deactivation of features (fig. 69W; ‘item ‘3’ reads on the claim ‘at least one identification digit’, ‘features’ reads on the claim ‘inactive CFV mode’ or ‘previously activated CFV mode’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mitchell in view of Lotito to represent the activation and the deactivation by at least one identification digit as taught by Elliott. The motivation for the modification is to introduce digit for the activation and deactivation of different features.

Art Unit: 2697

11. Claims 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitchell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,164,981) and in view of Elliott et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,335,927).

Regarding claim 21, Mitchell fails to teach “an encoding circuit to provide coded signals representative of content of utterances in coded format for inclusion in prompt signals”. Elliott teaches circuit switching infrastructure provide coded signals representative of content of utterances in coded format for inclusion in prompt signals (col.9, lines 10-14, col.272, lines 1-25; ‘circuit switching infrastructure’ reads on the claim ‘an encoding circuit’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mitchell to have the encoding circuit providing coded signals as taught by Elliott. The motivation for the modification is to introduce encoding circuit to convert data into code or analog voice into a digital signal.

Mitchell further fails to teach “an activation circuit to enable activation of the encoding circuit so that prompt signals provided by the system include such coded signals”. Elliott inherently teaches activation of the circuit switching infrastructure so that prompt signals provided by the system include such coded signals (col.9, lines 10-14, col.272, lines 1-25; ‘circuit switching infrastructure’ reads on the claim ‘an encoding circuit’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mitchell to have the encoding circuit providing coded signals as taught by Elliott. The motivation for the modification is to activate the encoding circuit to convert data into code or analog voice into a digital signal.

Regarding claim 22, Mitchell fails to teach “the activation circuit permits selection of prompt signals comprising one of: a combination of an utterance and coded signals

Art Unit: 2697

representative of content thereof; and coded signals representative of an utterance, without inclusion of such utterance". Elliott inherently teaches activation circuit permitting selection of prompt signals comprising a combination of name and password (col.256, lines 10-17; 'combination of name and password' reads on the claim 'combination of an utterance and coded signals representative of content'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mitchell to have the activation circuit permitting selection of prompt signals as taught by Elliott. The motivation for the modification is to have the activation circuit to make a selection.

Regarding claim 23, Mitchell fails to teach "the activation circuit enables activation of the encoder to cause the coded signals included in a prompt signal to represent all characters of an utterance label represented by such coded signals". Elliott teaches DTMF signals included in a prompt signal inherently representing voicemail messages (col.63, lines 3-17; 'DTMF signals' reads on the claim 'coded signals' and 'voicemail messages' reads on the claim 'all characters of an utterance label represented by such coded signals'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mitchell to have the coded signals included in a prompt signal as taught by Elliott. The motivation for the modification is to have the coded signals for leaving and retrieving the voice messages.

Conclusion

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alam Elahee whose telephone number is (703) 305-4822. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Fri from 9:00am to 5:30pm.

Art Unit: 2697

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Hofsass can be reached on (703)305-4717. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9314 for regular communications and (703) 872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

M. E.

MD SHAFIUL ALAM ELAHEE
December 24, 2002

KA Williams
Kimberly A. Williams
Primary Examiner
~~Technology Center 2700~~